



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,554	03/28/2001	Xavier Ducloux	PF010030	8997

7590 03/01/2004

JOSEPH S. TRIPOLI
THOMSON MULTIMEDIA LICENSING INC.
2 INDEPENDENCE WAY
P.O. BOX 5312
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

SENF, BEHROOZ M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/819,554

Applicant(s)

DUCLOUX ET AL.

Examiner

Behrooz Senfi

Art Unit

2613

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: 6.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 7-9.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____.


CHRIS KELLEY

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2300

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The newly amended claim 1 (after final), slightly changes the scope of the claim and is consider as a new issue.

Response to applicant arguments:


Applicant argues (paper no. 9, page 5) that the examiner statement regarding the motivation for combining the two references Wu '945 and Mihara '849 would not accomplish the object of the present invention. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in previous office action (paper no. 8, dated 5 Nov. 2003) Wu '945 (i.e. fig. 1) teaches image being split into panels and encoder being assign to each panels and being controlled by the master controller and suggest the use of (same) buffer (FI/FO) in video compression, also being controlled by the master controller and master controller (160), which in fact is a (single/global) rate controller (as applicant stated in page 5, controls the flow of data), and the supporting reference Mihara '849 teaches the missing limitation "VBV" used in video coding, which makes the two references combinable. Therefore taking the combined teaching of Wu '945 and Mihara '849 and replacing Wu's suggested video buffer (140) with "VBV" as taught by Mihara would meet the claimed invention. Furthermore, the motivation for combining two references does not have to be the same as the applicant invention, plus a rate controller can be used for minimizing the delay time (as suggested by Mihara, col. 2, lines 55).

Applicant argument (paper no. 9, pages 6 and 7) regarding Mihara fails to teach "rate controller for controlling the rate of each encoder based on the global rate". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Mihara teaches rate controller, thus controls the bit-rate of each encoder based on the global rate/data (col. 8, lines 1 – 10).

Application/Control Number: 09/819,554
Art Unit: 2613

Page 3

As for the arguments regarding "a single virtual buffering verifier, VBV" see the
above NOTE.


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600